

to determine whether there is sufficient evidence of a violation of a criminal law that would warrant presentation to a grand jury, charging, and then a trial. Congress's role is demonstrably and decidedly different.

I would like to thank Mr. Mueller for conducting his investigation with the utmost professionalism. For those of us who have seen him in action over many years, we expected nothing different. I would also like to thank Attorney General Barr for promptly communicating his conclusions with both Congress and the American people. Throughout Attorney General Barr's confirmation hearings, he stressed his intent to release as much information as possible, and he is now in the process of delivering on his word.

I agree with those on both sides of the aisle, as well as the President, who want the Mueller report to be released publicly. As much of the report as can be released, and consistent with existing law, should be made public so the American people can read it for themselves, but I also agree with the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator GRAHAM, that we also need to understand better how we got to this place.

We need to look at the decisions made by the leadership in the Department of Justice, the FBI, the intelligence community, and the Obama White House during the time in which this counterintelligence investigation was initiated against President Trump while he was still a candidate, and why, contrary to the practice as testified to by Attorney General Loretta Lynch, a defensive briefing was not given to the Trump campaign so they could know that the Russians were trying the doors and the windows and trying to get into the organization.

We know now, from Mr. Mueller's report, they were unsuccessful in establishing a connection and collusion, as the word has been used, but we know the investigation that initially was started, ultimately, came up empty-handed and resulted in this narrative, which prompted the appointment of a special counsel and this long investigation that Mr. Mueller has now completed. So we need to understand that better as part of our oversight responsibilities, particularly those of us, such as the Presiding Officer and I, who are on the Judiciary Committee who have explicit oversight responsibility for the Department of Justice as well as the FBI.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. President, on another matter, we will soon have an opportunity to vote on the Green New Deal. Since this resolution was introduced last month, there has been a lot of confusion about exactly what is in it and how much it would cost. Generally, those aren't great questions to leave unanswered when you are trying to pass something in the Senate. We need more information, to be sure.

When the resolution was released, it made some lofty promises: achieving

net zero greenhouse gas emissions, renovating or replacing all buildings to achieve maximum energy efficiency, and providing higher education, healthcare, and housing for everybody. Missing, of course, were some of the details about how these goals would be either feasible or affordable: no plans on how to incentivize the research and development of new, cleaner energy technologies; no specifics on how much it would cost to retrofit every existing building in the country; no estimates about how the long list of new entitlement programs would be funded. The confusion only grew stronger when one of the authors of the resolution released a background summary that made even more promises, again, with no assurance of any plan that would actually be feasible or could be implemented. The Congresswoman from New York claimed that the Green New Deal would even include a government-subsidized life for those who are unwilling to work. She said we will build high-speed rail that will make airline travel unnecessary, which came as a surprise to our colleagues from Hawaii, and she said we will replace every internal combustion engine in every vehicle. As you might imagine, there was a long list of unanswered questions.

The one thing we know about the Green New Deal is, it would be a bad deal for Texas. Our State has always embraced an "all of the above" attitude when it comes to energy. Our people don't expect handouts, but they do expect opportunities that only come with economic and individual freedom. They don't want to be told what the government will permit them to do or force them to do, and they certainly don't want to be taxed to death to support people who aren't willing to work. We believe the government that governs least governs best in a nation of laws, especially when it comes to our economy.

Texas keeps its taxes, government spending, and regulations at a rational minimum to give people and small businesses that create jobs the freedom to dream big and let the free market provide. We know it works. Lower taxes and less burdensome regulation draw businesses to our State. We are one of the fastest growing States in the Nation because people are literally voting with their feet. It is because we have seen jobs created and opportunities for everyone willing to work.

Our unemployment rate is at or below the national average. I believe, in Midland, TX, in the Permian Basin, it is 2.1 percent. They can't find enough able-bodied people to perform the good, well-paying jobs that exist. We know we lead the Nation in exports, fueling both the State's economy as well as that for the entire country.

As I just alluded, the major part of our State's success is our thriving energy industry. Something that will not come as a surprise to most people is the fact that Texas leads the country in both oil and natural gas production,

but what may surprise you is the fact that we are the No. 1 producer of electricity from wind energy. One-fourth of all U.S. wind energy comes from Texas. There is no doubt that Texas's position as the largest energy-producing State has secured our position as an economic powerhouse, but if the authors of the Green New Deal get their way, oil, gas, and all hydrocarbons will all be off-limits, and the results will be disastrous without anywhere else to turn for an alternative because renewables simply aren't prepared to fill that gap. Hundreds of thousands of people will lose their jobs, exports will decline, and without a reliable alternative power source, you can expect to spend most of your day in the dark. Instead of talking about plans that would hurt my constituents in Texas and bankrupt the entire country, let's have a serious conversation about real solutions.

A few weeks ago, our friend and colleague from Maine, Senator COLLINS, joined me on a tour of the NET Power demonstration plant in La Porte, TX. NET Power has developed a first-of-its-kind system that generates affordable energy from natural gas while producing zero emissions. These innovative carbon capture technologies are what our future should look like. If American companies don't produce them first, well, we know somebody else will. So in America we need to invest in new technologies that can take our most reliable and affordable energy sources and make them cleaner.

When Senator McCONNELL announced his intent to bring this bill to the floor, things got a little strange in the Senate. In my experience, if the majority leader says he will bring something you authored to the floor, you are thrilled—but not with the Green New Deal. The junior Senator from Massachusetts who introduced the resolution in the first place referred to this announcement as "sabotage."

Well, clearly something is wrong. I believe it is important for us to have a discussion about smart ways to reduce emissions and lessen our environmental footprint, but the way to do that is not through heavyhanded regulations or unrealistic goals to eliminate the fuel sources we need, nor is it about throwing in socialist government power grabs that only appeal to a radical wing of the other party, which is basically a distraction from the real issues we should be discussing.

The Green New Deal is bad for America, bad for Texas, and I urge my Democratic colleagues to stop this ideological race to the left and start working with us on practical solutions that actually have a chance to become law. I will vote no on the Green New Deal resolution, and I encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

FIX NICS ACT

Mr. President, this last Saturday marked 1 year since the Fix NICS Act was signed into law. This legislation meant a lot to me personally because it